

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/687,243	HALE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ronald D Hartman Jr.	2121	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ronald D Hartman Jr. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Charles Berman. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06 April 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-19.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant will amend the dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15 and 17 to render them independent. Specifically, and separately, the applicant will amend the independent claims to further define what is meant by "priority". The examiner and the applicant both agree that Sims teaches a hierarchy based on time, but does not teach a hierarchy of patrons, per se. Maeda et al briefly discusses "priority ranking", but does not discuss in any greater detail, what is explicitly meant by this "priority ranking". .